IPIECA

ICRC

DCAF
a centre for security, development and the rule of law

Host country security assessment guide

Social Responsibility

THE GLOBAL OIL AND GAS
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION
FOR ENVIRONMENTAL
AND SOCIAL ISSUES

www.ipieca.org

This guide is designed to be a practical tool to assisting companies in evaluating security contexts and identifying challenges. Users can download a copy of the interactive PDF and complete sections as required for each project.

The fields for user input and checkboxes are shown in light blue:

Host country security assessment guide

IPIECA

The global oil and gas industry association for environmental and social issues

ICRC

International Committee of the Red Cross

DCAF
a centre for security,
development and
the rule of law

The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces

Contents

INTRODUCTION

Prior to engaging or investing in new operations in a host country, companies need to assess and evaluate the risks involved. Complex environments pose particularly challenging security and human rights risks and require a thorough analysis of the security sector and actors. The Host Country Security Assessment guide is aimed to assist companies in evaluating the national and regional security contexts and identifying the different challenges that are likely to affect extractive operations.

Through a comprehensive list of guiding questions, the Security Assessment guide provides company representatives with a holistic overview of the security situation as well as a detailed analysis of all relevant actors situated within their social context and relations. The Security Assessment guide thereby lays the foundation for an informed and effective engagement with the national security sector that can help ensure security arrangements are in line with humanitarian law and human rights.

The user is advised to consider the assessment a team exercise and to not only include the security department, but a cross section of other departments. The assessment of the security sector and actors should also not be considered as a once-off exercise, but should be regularly updated throughout the different stages of engagement and operations. To this end, the guide may be used in combination with the DCAF-ICRC-IPIECA tool on 'Host Government Engagement Strategies', which draws on the insights from the assessment questions to help establish a strategy for the engagement and communication with national security sector representatives.

WHO IS THE ASSESSMENT GUIDE FOR?

The guiding questions included in the Assessment Guide were developed for all extractive companies, from small and medium-sized enterprises to large international companies with well-established assessment protocols and processes. Some companies may draw on the guiding questions in their entirety and use them to establish a comprehensive assessment process, while others may want to use the guide to identify and fill gaps within their existing assessment procedures and only draw on individual sections and/or questions.

HOW TO USE THE ASSESSMENT GUIDE

The guide is divided into two sections: 1) Host Country Overview and 2) Security Sector Assessment. The Host Country Overview assesses the legal and socio-political context that shapes the country's security environment. The Security Sector Assessment maps all relevant actors of the security sector and analyses the profile, relationships and conduct of core security actors.

The two sections are divided into categories of questions that focus on a particular security or contextual issue. All questions are formulated to be answered: 'Yes', 'No' or 'Partly'. Each category/topic has colour-coded answer cells in the colours red, orange and green. The colour-code represents a simple risk scoring system. An answer coded as red represents a high security risk, an orange answer a medium security risk and a green answer a low or no security risk. If the user is unsure between two answer cells, the higher threat should be chosen (red over orange; orange over green). Importantly, the colour-code does not imply that users should focus only on red issues and/or disregard green issues. It is just meant to help identify which issues are more risky than others, but, as clarified below, all issues need to be considered and further analysed.

If the user is unable to answer any question or if a question does not apply in a particular case, it can be left unanswered. The user is advised to return to the unanswered questions at a later stage and use the gaps as guiding questions for an in-country analysis. If a question is marked with a red exclamation mark it is considered highly important, pointing towards a significant, security-related human rights risk, and should be answered decisively as early as possible.

In addition to the colour-coded answer cells, a 'Comments / Potential Consequences & Effects' section has been added to each block of questions for users to note observations that may prove essential at later consultations / engagement stages.

	Yes	Part	No
⚠ Does the state face a realistic short- or mid-term threat of civil war, insurgency or international armed conflict?		✓	
Are any neighbouring countries particularly unstable or subject to internal conflict?	✓		
Are there active militias or insurgency groups in the country?			✓
Are parts of the country inaccessible due to separatist movements or armed rebellion?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

While there are no active insurgency groups, the conflict in the neighbouring country may give rise to such groups. <u>*Need for further investigation!*</u>

Different ethnic national groups identify with opposing conflict parties in the neighbouring country. While the country has been stable for many years the upcoming election may pose a realistic threat of civil war.

Country X is currently subject to internal conflict. As our operations are not in the border region or in immediate proximity to the conflict, a direct security threat is therefore unlikely – but the impact on other issues needs to be further analysed. Are weapons being brought into the country, or is criminality likely to increase?

First the user answers the individual questions based on the available information. If one question (in this example the last question) cannot be answered it can remain blank until further information has been obtained. Subsequently the user is urged to further analyse this initial set of security and human rights issues in the qualitative 'Comment / Potential Consequences & Effects' section. The qualitative dimension allows the user to:

a. clarify the level of any particular threat (e.g. operations not in the immediate proximity to the neighbouring country),

b. note relevant issues not covered by the block of questions (e.g. influx of small weapons),

c. highlight relations between different security issues, and

d. identify potential future threats for subsequent analyses (rise of insurgency groups due to neighbouring conflict).

Users are advised to qualitatively assess all issues and to not focus their efforts exclusively on red or amber issues. As the Example Analysis highlights, green issues can, on closer examination, include a high threat potential that needs to be accounted for.

To assist the user in answering the assessment questions, an Appendix of sources has been included that lists a range of free, online platforms and documents and indicates the particular sections for which each source may be relevant.

THE SECURITY SECTOR

Before completing the Security Assessment questions relating to specific security actors, it is important to provide a holistic overview of the security sector. A successful and inclusive analysis can only be conducted if all actors and institutions within the security sector and the relations among them are considered. For the purpose of this tool, we refer to 'security actors' as actors that influence the security environment rather than providing security. The term 'security actor' does not legitimise the actions or purpose of a particular institution or its personnel. Figure I provides a detailed overview of the security sector and security actors.

Figure I - *Overview of the security sector and security actors[1]*

Core Security Actors

- Armed Forces
- Police
- Special Public Security assigned to Company Operations
- Gendarmeries
- Paramilitary Forces
- Presidential Guard
- Border Guards
- Custom Authorities
- Reserve or Local Security Units

Management and Oversight Bodies

- The Executive
- National Security Advisory Bodies
- Legislature and Legislative Select Committees
- Ministry of Defence
- Ministry of Interior
- Customary and Traditional Authorities
- Financial Management Bodies
- National Human Rights Institutions
- Civil Society Organisations
- Others (Academia, Think Tanks, ...)

Non-statutory Security Actors

- Liberation Armies
- Guerilla Armies
- Private Bodyguard Units
- Private Security Companies
- Political Party Militias

Justice and Law Enforcement Institutions

- Judiciary
- Ministry of Justice
- Prisons
- Criminal Investigation and Prosection Services
- Human Rights Commissions and Ombudsman Institutions
- Customary and Traditional Justice Systems

1. Host country overview

1.1 Legal and policy framework

1.1.1 International

The international legal context can prove to be important for later steps in the engagement with the security sector. International Humanitarian and Human Rights conventions can, for instance, be used in discussions about human rights concerns with public security representatives or be referred to in written agreements (e.g. Memoranda of Understanding). The aim of this section is therefore to situate national efforts and issues within the international framework the country has agreed to uphold.

The 'Comments' section allows users to add additional information on national discussions around international conventions or whether the listed instruments have actually been implemented and adhered to in practice.

Users can distinguish between international conventions being 'Signed' or 'Ratified'. If a convention has been ratified it has not only been signed by the relevant state representative(s) but also been given effect domestically (or been introduced into the domestic legislation).

	Signed	Ratified	Comments
International Humanitarian and Human Rights Law Conventions			
Geneva Conventions and their Additional Protocols, 1949			
Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951			
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1965			
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966			
Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1966			

Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 1989			
International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, 1966			
Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2008			
Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 1979			
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 1999			
Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 1984			
Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 2002			
Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention, 1989			
Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989			
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Involvement of Children in Armed Conflict, 2000			
Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, 2000			
International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, 1990			
International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, 2006			
Voluntary Principles			
Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights			
UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights			

1.1.2 National

This section guides the user in the analysis of the national legal framework in relation to the security environment.

Separation of powers and rule of law	Yes	Part	No
Does the executive, legislative or judicial branch interfere significantly with each other and thereby challenge the 'separation of powers' (distinction between the executive, legislative and judicial branches, each with separate and independent powers and areas of responsibilities)?			
Have government (judicial, executive or legislative) decisions undermined respect for the rule of law (the principle that all people and institutions are subject and accountable to established laws, restricting the arbitrary exercise of power)?			
Do individuals or non-governmental institutions at local or regional levels claim judicial powers that challenge the rule of law?			
Is mob or vigilante justice prevalent or commonly accepted?			
Are state institutions (e.g. courts) in conflict with customary justice institutions (e.g. systems of community justice)?			
Are customary justice institutions known to be corrupt or to favour certain parts of the local population?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Laws and regulations of the security sector

	Yes	Part	No
Are security sector roles and mandates enshrined in the constitution/national legal framework?			
Are there formal legal processes for holding state and non-state security actors accountable?			
Is international human rights law enshrined in legislation pertaining to the security sector?			
'Are the rules and regulations governing the use of force codified in legislation or established policies?'[2]			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Access to justice

	Yes	Part	No
Is recourse to justice (e.g. courts) accessible to all?			
Are people able to access justice without putting themselves at risk?			
Do people who are otherwise unable to afford legal representation have the right and access to legal aid?			
Is the judiciary reported to be fair and free, not subject to corruption or a lack of due process?			
Are judicial decisions transparent and accessible?			
Are (vulnerable) groups (e.g. women, ethnic, religious, class, tribal) treated equally under the law?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

1.2 Socio-political factors

This section guides the user in the analysis of the socio-political context of the security environment.

Political context

	Yes	Part	No
Are government representatives appointed and arranged rather than elected by popular vote (directly or indirectly)?			
Is a democratic opposition banned or repressed?			
Are elections considered to have been corrupted or unrepresentative?			
Is a successful democratic transition yet to take place?			
Is the country dominated by a single party or leader?			
Is corruption known to be a problem within the government?			
Is the government dominated by one ethnic/tribal/religious group?			
Are women or any other groups banned from actively participating in political life?			
Are independent media or civil society banned or absent?			
Have government representatives voiced negative sentiments against foreign investors?			
Are groups of actors holding significant political influence and power in a position to threaten the government?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Socio-economic context

	Yes	Part	No
Are international extractive operations new to the country?			
'Is the economy highly dependent on natural resource exports?' [3] (32% or more of GDP revenue)			
'Does the country rank highly on the Human Poverty Index?' [4]			
'Has there been a recent economic decline or crisis?' [5] (e.g. GDP variation over time)			
Is there a high level of socio-economic inequality within the country? (Gini coefficient of ≥ 0.45)			
Is there a large proportion of unemployed youth?			
Are labour unions/organisations banned or non-existent?			
If present, are labour organisations often in tension with the government?			
⚠ Have there been violent demonstrations or conflicts related to socio-economic issues (e.g. labour conditions, inequality, and corruption) in recent times?			
⚠ Are there reports on labour exploitation in the country?			
'Is annual government military expenditure high as a percentage of GDP?' [6] (> 4%)			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Social context

Social context	Yes	Part	No
Does any ethnic/religious/tribal group hold significantly more socio-political power than others?			
⚠ Are there any latent tensions or ongoing conflicts between ethnic/religious/tribal groups?			
Has the public or any particular group voiced negative sentiment towards foreign investors?			
⚠ Is drug trafficking, human trafficking, smuggling or organised crime a widespread problem?			
Is drug dependency and addiction a known problem?			
Are political leaders and criminal groups known to collaborate?			
Is the domestic homicide rate more than 25 homicides per 100,000 population?			
Is gender-based violence widespread?			
Is there tension around numbers of immigrant workers?			
'Does high population density produce pressures relative to food supply and other life-sustaining resources?'[7]			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Conflict and challenges

Special attention and enhanced due diligence is advised for this section.

	Yes	Part	No
⚠ Is there an on-going conflict within the country?			
Is the state post-conflict, transitional or fragile?			
If yes, is there an ongoing presence of foreign security forces in the country?			
⚠ If yes, have these foreign forces been accused of Human Rights or International Humanitarian Law (IHL) violations?			
⚠ Does the state face a realistic short- or mid-term threat of civil war, insurgency or international armed conflict?			
Are any neighbouring countries particularly unstable or subject to internal conflict?[8]			
If yes, is conflict or the consequences of conflict (armed groups, refugees) likely to increase?			
Are there active militias or insurgency groups?			
⚠ If yes, have these groups been accused of Human Rights or IHL violations?			
Are parts of the country inaccessible due to separatist movements or armed rebellion?			
⚠ Does the government or public security forces have a history of Human Rights or IHL violations?			
If yes, have these violations been targeted at a certain ethnic/religious/class/tribal group?			
⚠ Is there internal or external displacement of the national population?			
⚠ Does the government cooperate/collude with groups accused of Human Rights or IHL violations?			
⚠ Have there been physical attacks against extractives personnel or facilities, or against security forces employed to protect extractives operations?			
'Is there a high proliferation of firearms and other weapons?'[9]			
Is regulation of the use of firearms and weapons adequate?			
Are border areas poorly monitored or unsupervised?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Dynamics at the region of operations/interest

	Yes	Part	No
Is the relative GDP of the region significantly different to the national GDP?			
Is the regional unemployment rate (as a percentage of the labour force) significantly higher than the national rate? [10]			
Is economic activity in the area significantly lower compared to other regions?			
Is the regional government considered to be corrupt or ineffective?			
Are military bases, police stations and other public security institutions underrepresented or absent from the area?			
Is the homicide rate significantly higher compared to other regions?			
Are local/regional government representatives appointed by the central government rather than elected at the local level?			
Have separatist or insurgent movements challenged the sovereignty of the central government in the region?			
Are there armed militia groups active in the region?			
⚠ Are there conflicting claims over land ownership or property rights between local, regional and national entities?			
Has the national government disregarded local communities in the past when granting extractive concessions/contracts?			
Are there indigenous groups in the area of interest?			
Are the status and rights of indigenous groups inadequately protected in national laws or regulations?			
Are consultation mechanisms between the government and indigenous groups lacking or absent?			
⚠ Have indigenous groups been in conflict with other local populations in the region?			
Have other foreign investment projects resulted in a negative perception amongst local populations of extractive operations?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

2. Security sector assessment

After having analysed the legal and socio-political context that shapes the security environment, the following Security Sector Assessment section focuses on the individualised analysis of all relevant core security actors. Most prominently the core security actors include the armed forces and police, but users should draw upon the comprehensive security sector chart found at the beginning of the document to identify all relevant actors. Indeed, while the analysis is focused on core security actors, it is essential to map and understand the relations of the core security actors with other non-statutory security actors as well as oversight bodies and justice institutions.

The section therefore first requires users to conduct a mapping of the security sector. The mapping enables the user to identify power relations and/or institutional conflict that could severely undermine any current or future security arrangements. Cells can remain blank if not applicable to the particular security actor.

2.1 Mapping of the security sector

	Present in the region of operations	Military (M) or civilian (C) controlled	Authority to arrest	Prior relationship with the company	Relationships / alliances with other core, non-statutory security actors	Tensions / conflict with other core, non-statutory security actors, oversight bodies or justice institutions	Responsible management and oversight bodies or judicial institutions (name)
Core security actors							
Armed forces							
Police							
Special public security at company operations							
Gendarmeries							
Paramilitary forces							
Presidential guards							
Border guards							
Custom authorities							
Reserve or local security units							
Non-statutory security actors							
Liberation armies							
Guerrilla armies							
Private bodyguard units							
Private security companies							
Political party militias							
Foreign forces in the country							
Foreign armed forces							

2.2 Profile of

Repeat the exercise as many times as necessary for each core security actor (i.e. armed forces, police, special public security assigned to company operations, gendarmeries, paramilitary forces, presidential guard, border guards, custom authorities, reserve or local security units) marked as present in the region of operations in Section 2.1. If any question does not apply to a particular security actor or cannot be answered at the current stage it can remain blank and be revisited at a later stage.

Organizational structure, processes and policies

	Yes	Part	No
Does the security actor have sufficient personnel to conduct operations in the assigned area? (Indicator: ratio of security personnel to local population; ideal: 3 police officers per 1,000 residents).			
Do personnel receive fair and regular payment?			
Do the security provider's personnel not commonly practice 'moonlighting' / have a secondary employment?			
Is the security actor controlled by a civilian (rather than military) actor?			
Are national commitments clearly communicated to regional/local levels (e.g. to local police stations)?			
Is the responsibility to approve use of force clearly defined and does the decision-making power rest exclusively with senior rank levels?			
Does the security actor have a merit-based recruitment, selection and promotion system?[11]			
If there is turnover at the senior management level, is there still strong compliance with previous agreements?			
Is there an independent complaints system for personnel?			
Does the security actor have *'an accurate system for establishing, adequately investigating and managing files of complaints, reports and testimonies?'*[12]			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Equipment

	Yes	Part	No
Is the security provider adequately equipped to conduct security operations in the assigned area, in terms of communications and transport?			
Are the security provider's personnel provided with protective equipment?			
Do the security personnel carry non-lethal weapons? (To be able to respond proportionately to security threats).			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Deployment

	Yes	Part	No
Is the security actor permanently deployed in the area of potential business operations?			
Is the distance from the base of operations short enough for the security actor to respond to emergency issues quickly?			
Is the security actor easily accessible for people who have problems or want to lodge complaints?			
Has the security actor provided protection to corporate operations in the past?			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Composition of public security forces

	Yes	Part	No
Are women represented?			
If yes, are they in senior management positions?			
Are ethnic, social or religious groups represented equally?			
If yes, are they in senior management positions?			
Are personnel generally deployed within their region of origin?			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Regulations and accountability

	Yes	Part	No
Does the security actor have a public mission/vision/values statement and code of conduct?			
Does the security actor have a human rights policy?			
Does the security actor have a financial management system in place that holds the actor accountable and allows for effective oversight of security operations and spending?			
Is there an independent complaints mechanism for the public?			
Have alleged abuses been successfully tried by the judiciary or oversight bodies in the past?			
If yes, were trials generally carried out with due process and independence?			
Is there an effective oversight of the stockpiles of the security actor's weapons?			
Does the population approve of and trust the work of the security actor?[13]			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Training

	Yes	Part	No
Have the following topics been covered in training:			
• Human rights			
• International humanitarian law			
• Religious, gender, sexual violence and cultural issues with respect to the local population			
• Rules for the use of force and firearms (Escalation/use of force continuum)			
• Detention procedures			
• Crowd control and public order			
• Practical training on the use of non-lethal weapons			
• Hostile environment training			
• Incident response and first aid			
Are practical exercises conducted as part of the training?			
Is attendance documented?			
Is the training being repeated on a regular basis?			
Are participants tested at the end of the training?			
If yes, do those who have not passed the test have to repeat the training?			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

2.3 Relations and conduct of

Repeat the exercise as many times as necessary for each core security actor marked as present in the region of operations in Section 2.1. If any question does not apply to a particular security actor or cannot be answered at the current stage it can remain blank and be revisited at a later stage.

Relationships and alliances

	Yes	Part	No
Do other groups, individuals or institutions influence decision making of the security actor in a way that poses a risk to security operations?			
Is the security provider responsible for both domestic and international security issues, in such a way that this compromises its ability to adequately carry out domestic responsibilities?			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Tensions and conflict

	Yes	Part	No
Does a conflict exist with other core or non-statutory security actors concerning spatial/ jurisdictional responsibility?			
Has the authority or competence of the security provider been undermined by the presence of other formal or informal security providers?			
If yes, is this likely to result in conflict or security incidents?			
Has the security actor disregarded any decisions by judicial institutions?			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Relationships with management, oversight and judicial institutions	Yes	Part	No
Are mechanisms in place to hold the security actor accountable?			
Are relevant management, oversight and judicial institutions independent?			
⚠ Are civil society organizations able to monitor the personnel for human rights violations and corruption without intimidation or undue interference? [14]			
Can the oversight bodies *undertake investigations and site visits at their own initiative? Can they institute proceedings in court?* [15]			
Are the recommendations and findings of independent oversight bodies binding? [16]			
Do oversight bodies have access to information on security incidents and security issues?			
Has the reliability of the oversight mechanisms remained unquestioned?			
Have ombudsmen or special commissions conducted examinations of the security actor in the past?			
If so, have findings and suggestions been followed?			
If so (to initial question), have civilian (rather than military) personnel led these examinations?			
Are there other international or regional oversight mechanisms that hold the security actor accountable? (e.g. regional human rights courts, UN special rapporteurs). [17]			
Comments / potential consequences & effects:			

Armed conflict

		Yes	Part	No
⚠	Has the security actor been involved in a domestic or international conflict within the last decade?			
⚠	Has the security actor been accused of having unofficially supported domestic insurgency groups?			
⚠	Has the security actor been accused of involvement in or support of conflicts in neighbouring countries?			
⚠	Has the security actor been involved in ethnic or religious conflicts/incidents in the past?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

Human rights record

Special attention and enhanced due diligence is advised for this section.

		Yes	Part	No
⚠	Has the security actor been accused of Human Rights or International Humanitarian Law (IHL) violations? [16]			
⚠	Has the security actor been accused of violence against a particular (vulnerable) group (e.g. women, ethnic or religious group)			
⚠	In the case of past security incidents, has the security actor been accused of using excessive force or acting outside its legal mandate?			
⚠	Has the security actor failed to investigate accusations of human rights violations against its personnel?			
⚠	Has the security actor failed to address human rights issues or ensure the prosecution of human rights violations?			

Comments / potential consequences & effects:

3. Annex - sources

	Dynamics at the region of operations	Conflict & challenges	Social context	Socio-economic context	Political context	Socio-political factors	Customary, unofficial and alternative legal systems	Access to justice	Laws and regulations of the security sector	Separation of powers and rule of law	International	Legal & policy framework
ACLED Regional and Country Reports on conflict in Africa: http://www.acleddata.com/research-and-publications/country-reports/		■										
Armed Conflict Database: https://acd.iiss.org/ (not free of charge)		■			■							
Armed violence/conflict map: http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/tools/interactive-map-charts-on-armed-violence.html		■			■							
Crisis Group conflict reports on individual countries: https://www.crisisgroup.org/		■										
Corruption perception map and index: https://www.transparency.org/country/ http://www.transparency.org/cpi2015					■			■				
GDP per capita: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/NY.GDP.PCAP.CD	■			■								
Gini coefficient: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI				■								
Global Gender Gap Report 2015: https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2015					■			■				
Government Defence Anti-Corruption Index: http://government.defenceindex.org/#close									■			
Inequality index: http://www.oecd.org/social/inequality.htm				■								
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) annual survey of violations of Trade Union Rights: http://survey.ituc-csi.org/?lang=en				■								
Homicide index: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/VC.IHR.PSRC.P5			■									
Legal system: https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/fields/2100.html							■					

Resource												
Military expenditure and balance: http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/MS.MIL.XPND.GD.ZS; http://www.sipri.org/research/armaments/milex/milex_database; https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/rankorder/2034rank.html https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/military-s-balance				▨								
Rule of Law Index: http://data.worldjusticeproject.org; http://worldjusticeproject.org/publications							▨		▨			
Security Sector country profiles: http://issat.dcaf.ch/Learn/Resource-Library/Country-Profiles		▨		▨				▨				
Security Sector Reform Resource Centre: http://www.ssrresourcecentre.org/countries/		▨	▨	▨				▨				
Trade union density: https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=UN_DEN	▨			▨								
Treaty collection: https://treaties.un.org/Pages/ParticipationStatus.aspx												▨
Unemployment, total (% of total labour force): http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SL.UEM.TOTL.ZS	▨			▨								
Universal Human Rights Index: http://uhri.ohchr.org/en		▨										
Uppsala Conflict Data Program: http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/search.php		▨										
Weapons of non-state armed groups: http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/publications/by-theme/weapons-and-markets.html		▨										
World Press Freedom Index: https://rsf.org/en/ranking					▨							

[1] Definitions and actors based on Security System Reform and Governance: Policy and Good Practice (OECD, 2004: 16-17)
[2] Interagency Security Sector Assessment Framework: Guidance for the U.S. Government (USAID, 2010: 18)
[3] Conflict-Sensitive Business Practice: Guidance for Extractive Industries (International Alert, 2005: 8)
[4] Ibid. 6
[5] Ibid. 8
[6] Ibid. 11
[7] OECD DAC Handbook on Security System Reform: Supporting Security and Justice (OECD, 2007: 53)
[8] Conflict-Sensitive Business Practice: Guidance for Extractive Industries (International Alert, 2005: 13)
[9] Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights: Implementation Guidance Tools (ICMM, ICRC, IFC and IPIECA, 2011: 25)
[10] Conflict-Sensitive Business Practice: Guidance for Extractive Industries (International Alert, 2005: 8)
[11] OECD DAC Handbook on Security System Reform: Supporting Security and Justice (OECD, 2007: 166)
[12] Ibid. 165
[13] Ibid.
[14] Ibid. 115
[15] Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Voluntary Principles on Security and Human Rights: Implementation Guidance Tools (ICMM, ICRC, IFC and IPIECA, 2011: 25)

IPIECA

IPIECA is the global oil and gas industry association for environmental and social issues. It develops, shares and promotes good practices and knowledge to help the industry improve its environmental and social performance, and is the industry's principal channel of communication with the United Nations.

Through its member-led working groups and executive leadership, IPIECA brings together the collective expertise of oil and gas companies and associations. Its unique position within the industry enables its members to respond effectively to key environmental and social issues.

14th Floor, City Tower, 40 Basinghall Street, London EC2V 5DE, United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7633 2388 E-mail: info@ipieca.org
Website: www.ipieca.org Twitter: @IPIECA LinkedIn: IPIECA

ICRC

Established in 1863, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) operates worldwide, helping people affected by conflict and armed violence and promoting the laws that protect victims of war. An independent and neutral organization, its mandate stems essentially from the Geneva Conventions of 1949. The ICRC is based in Geneva, Switzerland, and employs some 14,500 people in more than 80 countries. The ICRC is funded mainly by voluntary donations from governments and from national Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

19 Avenue de la paix, 1202 Geneva, Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 734 60 01 Website: www.icrc.org/en

DCAF is an international foundation established in 2000 on the initiative of the Swiss Confederation, as the 'Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces'. DCAF contributes to enhancing security sector governance (SSG) through security sector reform (SSR). The Centre's work to support effective, efficient security sectors which are accountable to the state and its citizens is underpinned by the acknowledgement that security, development and the rule of law are essential preconditions for sustainable peace. DCAF is guided by the principles of neutrality, impartiality, gender sensitivity and local ownership as the basis for supporting legitimate, sustainable reform processes. DCAF is based in Geneva with permanent offices in Beirut, Brussels, Ljubljana, Ramallah and Tunis. The Centre has over 140 staff from more than 30 countries.

P.O.Box 1360, CH-1211 Geneva 1, Switzerland
Tel: +41 (0) 22 730 9400 Website: www.dcaf.ch